

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-62 are pending in this Application.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 32-35, 37, 39, 41, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skladman (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,810).

Claims 5 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Kaars (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059384).

Claims 7, 9, 12, 38, 40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Reed (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325).

Claims 11 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561).

Claims 13, 14, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of McKinley (U.S. Patent No. 4,926,326).

Claims 16 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Wong (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,115).

Claims 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041265).

Claims 19 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Kaars.

Claims 21, 23, 26, 52, 54, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Reed.

Claims 25 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Dillon.

Claims 27, 28, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and McKinley.

Claims 31 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier and Wong.

Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 are independent.

With this response claims 1, 17, 29, 32, 48, and 60 are amended, and claims 7 and 38 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

II. Priority

The Office Action states that “Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 ...”.

With this response, Applicants include a further executed declaration.

Applicants respectfully submit that, at least with submission of this further declaration, all conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date have been met.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph

Turning to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, Applicants note that the Office Action contends that though the use of “freezing display”, the claim “contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time application

was filed, has possession of the claimed invention”.

Applicants, with reference, for instance, to their response to the last Office Action, respectfully disagree with the contention. Nevertheless, to facilitate prosecution, with this response Applicants amend each of claims 1, 29, 32, and 60 such that “freezing display” is removed. No new matter has been added.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Turning to the rejection of claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, Applicants note that the Office Action argues that “it is unclear to the examiner what is meant to be disclosed by ‘an idle state’”.

In view, for instance, of their response to the last Office Action, Applicants respectfully disagree with the argument. Nevertheless, to facilitate prosecution, with this response Applicants amend each of claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 such that “idle state” is removed. No new matter has been added.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

V. Amendment of Independent Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48

With this response, each of independent claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 is amended. No new matter has been added.

Turning to independent claims 1 and 32, Applicants note that these claims, as

amended herewith, include:

“... capturing a visual state of said displaying, wherein portions of the captured visual state correspond to one or more of said events;

displaying the captured visual state to the user; and

enabling said user to select one or more of said portions of the captured visual state for activating corresponding operations”.

Responding to Applicants’ arguments submitted December 20, 2004, the Office Action apparently suggests the amendment of claims 1 and 32 as amended herewith, the Office Action indicating that, in absence of such amendment, it “[can] not reasonably be asserted to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claim language used ... was meant to embody” such functionality, and, “[a]s such” Skladman would be continued to be applied against the claims if not amended.

Applicants agree that Skladman fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least the above-quoted aspects of claims 1 and 32 as amended herewith and, in view of at least the foregoing, respectfully submit that these claims, as well as those claims that depended therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Turning to independent claims 17 and 48, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for instance, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein maintaining, receiving, and displaying are performed while a user interface of said node is displaying a screensaver”

as set forth in each of claims 17 and 48 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 48, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

VI. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4139. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any

VI. Dependent Claim Rejections

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No.

4208-4139. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 28, 2005

By:



Angus R. Gill

Registration No. 51,133

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8746
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)